UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/627,223	07/27/2000	Gerald Francis McBrearty	AUS9-2000-0273-US1	1175

7590 08/26/2003

International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Department
Internal Zip 4054
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER	
MAURO JR, THOMAS J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2143	3

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/627,223	MCBREARTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas J. Mauro Jr.	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 July 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

1. Claims 1-21 have been examined.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,487,588 to Phillips et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,033 to Duvall et al.

5. With respect to claim 1, Phillips et al. teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including, a system for reducing the downloading time of predetermined hypertext documents received from said Web comprising:

a. Means at a receiving display station for downloading said received hypertext Web documents (**Fig 4, Col. 5 lines 2-4**),

b. Means enabling a user at said receiving display station to preselect received Web documents to be downloaded in a text-only mode,

c. Means for determining whether a received Web document has been preselected for downloading in a text-only mode, and

d. Means responsive to said determining means for downloading such received preselected Web documents in a text-only mode.

In limitations b, c, and d to claim 1, Phillips et al. teaches a downloading mode within a web browser which enables the user to specify a graphics off mode which allows the user to view web pages with regular text and no graphics (**Col. 4 lines 19-23**). It is also noted that the applicant discloses in the specification that web browsers which permit users to select a setting for all received web documents to be displayed either in full HTML or text-only format are known. Phillips et al., however, does not teach a means enabling the user to preselect Web documents, a means for determining whether a received Web document has been preselected for downloading, and a means responsive to said determining means for downloading such received preselected Web documents.

Duvall et al. teaches a filtering database (**Col. 3 line 64**) which compares the IP address of the URL with a field indicating whether to allow or block the particular site entered (**Col. 4 lines 22-27**). He does not, however, disclose a filtering database for allowing preselected pages to be downloaded without graphics in a text-only mode.

While Duvall et al.'s type of filtering database deals with protecting users from obscene and objectionable Web content, it is well known that other types of filters can readily be created by simply changing some of the fields within the database. Therefore, it would be obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that a plurality of filters could be setup, comparing the IP address of the URL to a field which denotes whether or not the page should be displayed in text-only mode, to allow for certain pages specified by the user to be downloaded in text-only mode.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the above-modified filter of Duvall et al. into the Web browser system disclosed by Phillips et al. which would allow the browser to query the database with the URL or IP address of the site in order to determine (limitation c) if the page was preselected (limitation b) for text-only mode and to respond (limitation d) accordingly (**Duvall – Col. 8 lines 3-5 – The filter database provides the means for preselecting, determining, and means responsive to the Web documents for downloading in text-only mode**). The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a means for the user to set-up a preselected list of sites to be downloaded in text-only format to alleviate the burden of having to turn graphics on and off for each site visited.

6. With respect to claim 3, Phillips et al. teaches the invention substantially as claimed wherein the user is enabled to preselect web documents which will be downloaded in a text-only mode. Phillips et al., however, does not teach preselecting domains from which all documents will be downloaded in text-only mode.

Duvall et al., however, teaches a filtering database which compares the IP address of the URL with a field indicating whether to allow or block the particular site entered. One method of filtering allows access to families of URL's, i.e. domains (**Col. 7 line 8**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. as applied in the rejection to claim 1 above, to include domains as a preselecting filter category as disclosed in Duvall et al. to give the user the ability to quickly and easily filter out everything but text for websites in a given domain.

7. With respect to claim 4, Phillips et al. teaches the invention substantially as claimed wherein the user is enabled to preselect web documents which will be downloaded in a text-only mode. Phillips et al., however, does not teach preselecting specific sites from which all documents will be downloaded in text-only mode.

Duvall et al., however, teaches a filtering database which compares the IP address of the URL with a field indicating whether to allow or block the particular site entered. One method of filtering allows access to specific sites (**Col. 7 line 8**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. as applied in the rejection to claim 1 above, to include specific sites as a preselecting filter category as disclosed in Duvall et al. to give the user the ability to quickly and easily filter out everything but text for a certain particular web documents.

8. With respect to claim 5, Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. teach the invention substantially as claimed, said means for enabling a user at said receiving display station to preselect domains (**Duvall – Col. 7 line 8**) from which all received Web documents will be

downloaded in a text-only mode (**Phillips – Col. 4 lines 19-23**), and said means for determining whether a received Web document has been preselected for downloading in a text-only mode (**Duvall – Col. 8 lines 3-5 – The filter database provides the means for preselecting, determining, and means responsive to the Web documents for downloading in text-only mode**).

9. With respect to claim 7, Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. teach the invention substantially as claimed, including means at said receiving display station for storing said user's preselection of Web documents to be downloaded in a text-only mode (**Duvall – Col. 3 lines 44-45 – The preselections are made within the database which is stored on the computer's storage**).

10. With respect to claims 8, 10-12, and 14, they are method claims corresponding to the system claimed in claims 1, 3-5, and 7. Therefore, claims 8, 10-12, and 14 are rejected under the same rationale.

11. With respect to claims 15, 17-19, and 21, they are program claims corresponding to the system claimed in claims 1, 3-5, and 7. Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. teach a computer connected to the Internet and a web browser (**Phillips – Col. 4 line 67 and Col. 5 lines 1-5**). In addition, the filter database for preselecting Web documents in an effort to reduce the downloading time (**Duvall – Col. 3 lines 44-45**). It is obvious that in order for a web browser to operate and the database to filter the URL's, code must be stored on some type of computer

readable medium in order for the browser and database to function. Therefore, claims 15, 17-19, and 21 are rejected under the same rationale as applied to claims 1, 3-5, and 7 above.

12. Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,852 to Himmel et al.

13. With respect to claim 2, Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. as applied in claim 1, teaches enabling the user to preselect said text-only mode to thereby enable the user to preselect whether the web documents will be downloaded in a text-only mode when received (**Duvall – Col. 8 lines 3-5 – The filter database provides the means for preselecting, determining, and means responsive to the Web documents for downloading in text-only mode**). However, Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. do not teach a means for bookmarking selected received web documents and further preselecting whether the bookmarked web document will be downloaded in a text-only mode when received.

Himmel et al. teaches a means for bookmarking selected received Web documents to thereby store at said receiving display station, direct links to the documents for future access (**Col. 5 lines 34-45**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the bookmarking of Web documents into the invention of Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. in order to give the user more flexibility in specifying text-only mode for commonly viewed pages instead of requiring them to type in the URL each time.

14. With respect to claim 6, Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. as applied in claim 1 and further in view of Himmel et al. teach the invention substantially as claimed, a web browsing means at said receiving display station including: means for bookmarking (**Himmel – Col. 5 lines 34-45**), and means for determining whether a received Web document has been preselected for downloading in a text-only mode (**Duvall – Col. 8 lines 3-5 – The filter database provides the means for preselecting, determining, and means responsive to the Web documents for downloading in text-only mode**).

15. With respect to claims 9 and 13, they are method claims corresponding to the system claimed in claims 2 and 6. Therefore, claims 9 and 13 are rejected under the same rationale.

16. With respect to claims 16 and 20, they are program claims corresponding to the system claimed in claims 2 and 6. Phillips et al. in view of Duvall et al. teach a computer connected to the Internet and a web browser (**Phillips – Col. 4 line 67 and Col. 5 lines 1-5**). In addition, the filter database for preselecting Web documents in an effort to reduce the downloading time (**Duvall – Col. 3 lines 44-45**). It is obvious that in order for a web browser to operate and the database to filter the URL's, code must be stored on some type of computer readable medium in order for the browser and database to function. Therefore, claims 16 and 20 are rejected under the same rationale as applied to claims 2 and 6 above.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent No. 6,023,701 to Malik et al. teaches skeleton page Web navigation mode which in one embodiment can be modified to download and view text only. U.S. Patent No. 5,896,502 to Shieh et al. teaches an a transfer control system which reduces delay by setting limits regarding downloading size and time for particular objects.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Thomas J. Mauro Jr.
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

TJM
8/15/03

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100